

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-13 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of May 27, 2004, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Priority

The priority for the present application has been inserted into the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The claims have now been amended to clarify the invention claimed.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleges that the instant method of inhibiting cyclooxygenase-2 reaches out to as yet unidentified

conditions/activities/diseases, the description of which is said not to be found in the specification.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 12 is not directed to treating specific diseases/conditions/activities, but merely to a method for inhibiting cyclooxygenase-2 in a patient in need thereof by administering to that patient an effective amount of a compound according to claim 1. Test Example 1, which begins on page 119, clearly demonstrates that a number of the compounds of the present invention are effective in inhibiting cyclooxygenase-2 while not affecting cyclooxygenase-1. Therefore, the method of inhibiting cyclooxygenase-2 has been well described in the specification, namely, by administering to a patient in need thereof an effective amount of a compound according to the present invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The present inventors have demonstrated in Test Example 1 beginning on page 119 that the compounds of the present invention are effective in inhibiting cyclooxygenase-2 while not affecting cyclooxygenase-1. One skilled in the art knows that COX-1 is usually expressed under normal circumstances,

whereas COX-2 is specifically expressed in inflammation. As described in the specification as filed at page 1, last paragraph, "this COX-2 has been clarified to be induced during inflammation and hardly be expressed at all under normal circumstances." This inexorably links COX-2 with inflammation.

Conventional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agents (NSAIDs) inhibit both COX-1 and COX-2. They exert their anti-inflammatory activity by inhibiting COX-2, while causing side effects such as gastrocytosis by inhibiting COX-1. Therefore, a compound which specifically inhibits COX-2 is useful for treating inflammation, while scarcely causing any side effects from inhibition of COX-1.

The invention as recited in claim 12 relates to a method for inhibiting COX-2 in a patient in need thereof by administering a compound of formula (1), which compound specifically inhibits COX-2. One skilled in the art, confronted with a patient exhibiting inflammation, would know that inhibiting COX-2 is a specific method for reducing the inflammation. One skilled in the art can readily determine an effective dosage of the compounds of claim 1 effective to inhibit inflammation without undue experimentation.

It is clear from the above that inhibition COX-2 inhibits inflammation. Therefore, it is respectfully

submitted that the scope of the claims is commensurate with the objective enablement. There is no reason to enumerate all of the conditions that can be treated in this manner, as the common feature is inflammation, which the compounds of the present invention have been demonstrated to inhibit.

Allowable Subject Matter

The inventive compound, its composition and method of treating inflammation would be allowable upon obviating the 112 second paragraph rejection.

As it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been obviated, it is believed that claims 1 and 4-13 are now allowable.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:jec
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\T\tsuk\Matsuoka 16A\Pto\AMD 12 AUG 04.doc